



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,232	06/05/2006	David Loupia	FR920030069US1	3810

45095 7590 03/02/2011  
HOFFMAN WARNICK LLC  
75 STATE ST  
14 FL  
ALBANY, NY 12207

EXAMINER
----------

RECEK, JASON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2442

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

03/02/2011

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOCommunications@hoffmanwarnick.com

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/596,232

Applicant(s)

LOUPIA, DAVID

Examiner

JASON RECEK

Art Unit

2442

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 December 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7 and 8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7 and 8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04 January 2011</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This is in response to the amendment filed on December 14<sup>th</sup> 2010.

### ***Status of Claims***

Claims 1-4 and 7-8 are pending, of which claims 1-4 and 7-8 are currently amended.

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments, see pg. 5, with respect to the 101 rejection have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 101 rejection of claims 4, 6 and 8 has been withdrawn.
2. Applicant's arguments, see pg. 5-7, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-4 and 7-8 under 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Specifically, the argument that the combination does not teach checking for redirection in the header is persuasive (the art clearly teaches redirecting). Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Koeppel US 2005/0015491 A1.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 1-4 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Butterworth et al. US 2004/0133656 A1 in view of Lewontin US 2005/0071419 A1, Hickman US 2005/0198188 A1 and Koeppel US 2005/0015491 A1.

Regarding claim 1, Butterworth discloses "redirecting a request for a web service in a data transmission network" (paragraph 45), "forwarding a first request from the client server to an address of said web service" (paragraphs 13, 44), "responding to the client server from a web service point associated with said old address" response sent from web service (Fig. 4) and "forwarding a second request from the client server to the new address of said web service" redirect (i.e. forward) to the new address of the web service (i.e. address of backup service) when failure occurs (paragraphs 58, 63).

Butterworth does not explicitly disclose "sending back a message with a header, wherein the header using said message exchange protocol contains a redirection to a new address" however this is taught by Lewontin as including a web service address in a header as a SOAP message (paragraph 44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Butterworth to include the address passing feature of Lewontin for the purpose of redirecting web service

Art Unit: 2442

requests. Lewontin suggests that by doing so web services can be provided from mobile devices (paragraphs 9-11).

The combination of Butterworth and Lewontin does not explicitly disclose “determining the address of the web service is an old address by checking a list of outdated web services” however this is taught by Hickman as identifying suitable web services from a list of web services (abstract, paragraph 7). One of ordinary skill in the art would understand that identifying a suitable service is equivalent to determining if the address is an old address as recited by the claim. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Butterworth and Lewontin to verify a web service address as taught by Hickman for the purpose of using that web service. Hickman suggests that by searching a list of web services, new services can be discovered (paragraphs 6-8).

The combination of Butterworth, Lewontin and Hickman does not explicitly disclose “checking, using a checker on the client server, for the redirection in the header of the message” however this is taught by Koeppel as determining whether any redirect tags are present in the data stream received from a web service, checking the entire data stream would include checking the header (paragraph 94, Fig. 13 step 1333). Although Koeppel teaches making the check / determination at the “harness”, Koeppel suggests this is a virtual server that is part of the client system (paragraph 36) thus the check is made “on the client server” as recited by the claims. Also, Butterworth discloses that the client (e.g. agent acting as client) performs the redirection check (paragraph 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

Art Unit: 2442

of the invention to modify the combination of Butterworth, Lewontin and Hickman with the redirect checking taught by Koeppel for the purpose of authentication. Koeppel teaches allowing only web services that are authorized (paragraph 14, Fig. 7).

Regarding claim 2, Butterworth discloses "new address ... is logged by said host" as storing an address in the form of a WSDL file (paragraphs 13-14).

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Butterworth and Lewontin does not explicitly disclose "said redirection is a SOAP header tag", however Butterworth does disclose "message exchange protocol is SOAP" (Fig. 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention use a header tag for redirection. The SOAP specification provides header blocks. Redirecting requests is disclosed by the references. Thus naming a header tag redirect would have been obvious since that is the purpose of the message. This is similar to relaying a SOAP message, when doing so the SOAP specification provides for a header block that is aptly named relay.

Regarding claim 4, it is a system claim that corresponds to the method of claim 1; those corresponding parts (web service, address redirection, response message) are rejected for similar reasons. Butterworth also discloses "a checker in a SOAP runtime" as software for passing SOAP messages (Fig. 4, paragraphs 37, 44-45). The message is analyzed/checked (paragraph 38).

Regarding claim 7, Butterworth discloses "HTTP" (paragraph 11).

Regarding claim 8, it is a system claim that corresponds to the method of claim 7, therefore it is rejected for similar reasons.

### ***Conclusion***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lita EP 1041496 A2 discloses using a session identifier to redirect messages between client and server (abstract).

DeBettencourt et al. US 2002/0042823 A1 discloses a system for managing web services including load balancing and redirection (abstract).

Knutson et al. US 2005/0160153 A1 discloses a method of addressing web services (abstract) including correcting an outdated address (paragraph 64).

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASON RECEK whose telephone number is (571)270-1975. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on (571) 272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 2442

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jason Recek/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2442  
(571) 270-1975

/KEVIN BATES/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2456